MINUTES

eHealth Care Quality and Patient Safety Board Information Exchange Workgroup August 24, 2006

Location: 1 W. Wilson Street, Room 372, Madison

Time: 4:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Members

- Susan Turney
- Denise Webb
- Louise Wenzlow
- Hugh Zettel (Chair)

Resources

Keith Haugrud

Staff

- Seth Foldy
- Stacia Jankowski
- Audrey Nohel
- Judith Nugent
- Susan Wood

Approval of meeting minutes

The minutes of August 17 were approved as written.

Draft Action Plan Outline

Stacia Jankowski informed the workgroup that a draft outline for the action plan had been provided for their review. She requested comments by the close of business Tuesday, August 29.

Hugh Zettel said that he thought the introduction should address some of the problems or concerns that are trying to be addressed through this initiative. He provided the example of a glaring statistic that Arizona provided, which compared the cost of health care spending to school spending as a means to rally support for investment in electronic health care systems.

Mr. Zettel suggested taking the barriers and incentives identified at the July 20 face-to-face meeting as a starting point in discussing these issues.

Discuss recommendations from the Consumer Interests Workgroup regarding sensitive information

Seth Foldy and Stacia Jankowski provided an overview of the Consumer Interests Workgroup's discussion and deliberation. The workgroup made the assumption that proper security and safeguards will be in place to ensure that patient data is adequately protected, ensuring that only those that need and have the authority to view the data are able to do so. The Consumer Interests Workgroup plans to recommend that Wisconsin law be changed to more closely align with HIPAA for treatment purposes only, with the caveat that not all members of the workgroup were in agreement with this recommendation. The

Consumer Interests Workgroup plans to discuss sensitive information for public health and research purposes in future meetings.

From this report, the workgroup discussed the concept of harmonization and identifying where Wisconsin is in terms of state restriction of health data. This led to a discussion of the idea of restricting the exchange of health data to organizations that are identified as HIPAA-covered entities as a minimum requirement of exchange. It was recommended that this discussion be brought back to the Governance Workgroup for its consideration.

Dr. Foldy also reported on the plans to hold a listening session in September. Ms. Jankowski said that all workgroup members should receive an invitation in the mail.

Use case scenarios

Dr. Foldy provided a brief overview of the purpose of the use cases, and asked for comments from the workgroup. He said that the recommendations were obtained through the survey results and a discussion of the steps needed to build the system. The use case scenarios are not necessarily in sequential order, and some opportunities may overlap.

Louis Wenzlow asked if in developing this document, the Patient Care Workgroup had considered a model in which the provider list is developed first, then basically a post office model, much like the Utah system. Dr. Foldy responded that the focus was on claims first to develop the business model, and then moving to the clinical data.

Dr. Foldy said that the Patient Care Workgroup is working to further fine-tune these and plans to review the next iteration at its next meeting. He asked that any comments be sent to him or Ms. Jankowski for incorporation within the next week.

Proposed listening session

Susan Wood provided a proposal on holding a joint listening session for stakeholders of the Patient Care and Information Exchange workgroups. Both groups of stakeholders are concerned about similar issues, and holding a joint session would allow each group to hear these concerns from both perspectives. The workgroup agreed that Ms. Wood's proposal sounded reasonable, and that staff could begin to look at dates in late September and early October. Ms. Jankowski will forward the materials to both workgroups for review and comment following the meeting.